



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,693	01/20/2006	Alastair Dixon	GJE-7135	9643
23557 7590 05/19/2008 SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950				
EXAMINER WOOLWINE, SAMUEL C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1637				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

10/520,693

Applicant(s)

DIXON ET AL.

Examiner

SAMUEL WOOLWINE

Art Unit

1637

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-19.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Young J Kim/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument that the examiner has not provided the "requisite motivation to combine the teachings of the Richardson et al. and Gu et al. publications" (page 5 of the reply) is not found persuasive. As a preliminary matter, the Supreme Court decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007) forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness (see *Ex parte Smith*, slip op. at 20, June 25, 2007 available at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpail/prec/fd071925.pdf>). Furthermore, the examiner clearly pointed out a reason why it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt Gu's method of combining first and second strand cDNA synthesis in a single step using thermostable DNA polymerases with reverse transcriptase activity on page 8 of the Office action mailed 03/05/2008 (specifically, it would have been more efficient and it could be carried out at elevated temperature, thus overcoming the problem of RNA secondary structure during reverse transcription (the latter motivation was explicitly taught by Gu, and the former would have been appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art)). To suppose that one of skill in the art would not have recognized that combining two steps into one would not have offered an advantage is to suppose that one of skill in the art lacked common sense. Furthermore, it is submitted that it is not the examiner's burden to prove that Richardson's method was inefficient, contrary to Applicant's arguments. Even an efficient process can benefit from improvement. Finally, Applicant's assertions that the claimed methods were unpredictable and moreover offer an unexpected advantage are not supported by any evidence. Therefore, the rejections are maintained.